

No. 9/6/86-6Lab./2838.—In Pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the Workman and the management of M/S Engineer and Consultants, 200 H.M.T. Ancillary Unit, Panchkula.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V.P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT AMBALA

Ref. No. 35 of 1985

SHRI JAGGAR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE MESSRS ENGINEER AND CONSULTANTS 200 H.M.T. ANCILIARY UNIT, PANCHKULA.

Present.—Shri Abhey Singh for workman.

Shri R.L. Chopra for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of powers conferred,—*vide* clause (C) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred dispute between Shri Jaggar Singh and Messrs Engineers Consultants, Panchkulla to this Court. The terms of the reference are as under:

“Whether termination of services of Shri Jaggar Singh workman is justified and correct if so to what relief is he entitled?”

Shri Jaggar Singh alleged that he served respondent management continuously for four years. On 30th July, 1984 his services were terminated without assigning any reason what so ever in violation of section 25 (F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He prayed for reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent management contested the case and contended that statement of claim is bad in the eyes of law because it has not been properly signed and varified by the workman. It was also contended that workman left the job at his own and the management never terminated services of the workman. It was also prayed that even now the management is ready to accept services of the workman.

Workman filed replication through which he controverted the allegations of the respondent management.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed: for just decision of this case.

Issues:

1. Whether the termination order dated 30th April, 1984 is justified if so its effect? OPM
2. Whether claim statement is not proper and according to law if so its effect.
3. Relief.

I have heard Shri Abhey Singh for workman and Shri R.L. Chopra for respondent management and have perused the oral and documentary evidence placed on the file. My issue wise findings are as under.

Issue No. 1

In support of this issue management examined Shri Dinesh partner of respondent management. He stated that workman remained absent on 2, 12, 28, in July, 1984. Thereafter he reported on duty on 29th July, 1984 and he again absented on 30th April, 1984 and thereafter he never appeared either in the office of the respondent management nor he reported for duty. Letters Ex-M-1 to M-4 were written to workman in spite of, that he did not turn up to join his duty on the contrary he filed a complaint. Copy of the same is Ex-M-1 with the Labour Inspector where the matter was patched up between the parties and workman was directed to report for duty but the workman never turned up. One day workman appeared in the office of management, his accounts were cleared and payment of his dues was made in this court.

From the other side Jaggar Singh appeared as AW-1. He repeatedly stated that he never absented from duty in fact management refused to take him in job. He also stated that the management used to take more over time than the required hours and also used to make less payment towards overtime period. He also stated that he neither appeared before L. I. nor before Labour Officer.

In view of this evidence it is clear that case of the management is that workman voluntarily absented and left the job. On the other hand workman's stand is that he wanted to join duty but management never allowed him to do so.

But from the letters Ex-M-1 and Ex-M-2 and Ex-M-8 it is definite that management wanted to take the workman in its service. But the workman himself did not join job of the management and this fact is further clear from the statement of workman himself when he stated that the management wanted that he should work for more over time and workman was not in a mood to work for less wages for the extra overtime. The plea of the management has to be accepted on this score that workman wanted either full dues or wages for the extra overtime or he was not in a mood to work for extra overtime. So due to this fact workman himself left the job of the management so this issue is decided against the workman, in favour of, management.

Issue No. 2:

The claim statement and replication both have been signed by Shri Abhey Singh. The demand notice appeared to have been signed by Shri Jaggar Singh when demand notice was put to Jaggar Singh then he denied his signature on it, he also stated that he is illiterate and never signed the demand notice which shows that signatures of Jaggar Singh are forged so the claim statement is definitely bad for non signing or non thumb-marking and nonproperly verifying by the workman.

Issue No. 3 Relief:

For the fore-going reason on the basis of my issue wise findings I think that it is a case of abandonment of service by the workman himself and there is no question of retrenchment of workman by the management. So I pass award regarding the controversy between Jaggar Singh and Messrs Engineers Consultants accordingly

Dated 27th February, 1986

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 665, dated 4th March, 1986

Forwarded (Four Copies) to the Financial Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

The 16th April, 1986

No. 9/9/86-6 LAB./2794.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Haryana Roadways, Karnal.

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 193 of 1982

SHRI AJIT SINGH DRIVER AND

between

THE MANAGEMENT OF HARYANA ROADWAYS, KARNAL

Present:—

Shri Mukand Lal Chanana, for the workman.

Shri S. N. Gaur for the Management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Ajit Singh Driver and the Management of Haryana Roadways, Karnal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ajit Singh Driver was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. The claimant in his claim statement dated 13th July, 1982 alleged that he had put in 13 years service as Driver with the respondent management, but his services were terminated on 8th October, 1980 without any notice or any enquiry. It was further alleged that termination of his service was illegal and against the principles of natural justice. It was, therefore, prayed that the claimant be reinstated with full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement dated 17th August, 1982 pleaded that the claimant took liquor during the course of duty as Bus Driver and that he created nuisance by stopping the bus at Mal Road, Karnal which was full of Passengers. It was further pleaded that the services of the claimant were terminated for his conduct leading to his conviction in a Criminal case under Section 34 of the Police Act.

3. The claimant in his rejoinder dated 16th September, 1982 reiterated the pleas taken in the claim statement.

4. On the pleading of the parties, the following issues were framed on 16th September, 1984 :—

(1) Whether the termination of services of Shri Ajit Singh Driver was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. It may be mentioned that the Management have examined one witness and documents Exhibit M-1 and M-2 have been tendered into evidence. The claimant has examined 4 witnesses and document Exhibit W-1 has been tendered into evidence. After going through the entire evidence and hearing the representatives of both the parties, my finding on the above issue is as under :—

Issue No. 1 :

6. The Management has examined MW-1 Shri Dharam Singh Clerk, Haryana Roadways Karnal, who stated that he had brought the file of the claimant and a report was received against the claimant on 12th September, 1980 regarding drinking while on duty at Bus No. 4996 and that the claimant brought the bus in a drunken condition from Dhand to Sitamai and that Shri Dalip Singh Driver brought the bus from Sitamal to Karnal. He further stated that the claimant was arrested by the Police and was tried and convicted vide order copy Exhibit M-1. He also stated that services of the claimant were terminated,—vide order Exhibit M-2.

7. Shri Ajit Singh claimant WW-1 stated that he was employed by the respondent. He further stated that it was alleged that the claimant had driven the vehicle in a drunken condition, which allegation was false. He further stated that the vehicle became defective and was brought to the workshop when he left for his house at 7.00 p.m. He further stated that another driver was sent to his house at about 10.30 p.m. to come for duty, but he was not in a position to come again and that he was challaned by the police when he was administered a warning by the Court. WW-2 Shri Raj Pal Fitter stated that he had examined the vehicle but he could not repair it and that the vehicle was sent to workshop for repair. WW-3 Shri Sugra Ram stated that he was travelling in the Bus in question and that the vehicle was brought to bus stand Karnal at 7.30 p.m. by the claimant. WW-4 Shri Jagtar Singh stated that the Vehicle of the claimant became defective and that the same was brought to Haryana Roadways Karnal by him. Exhibit WW-1 is the copy of First Information Report lodged with the Police.

8. A perusal of the above evidence would show that on 12th September, 1980, the claimant drove Bus No. 4996 in a drunken condition and that the claimant was challenged and convicted under Section 34 of the Police Act and was admonished by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Karnal, when he pleaded guilty,—vide copy of the order Exhibit M-1. The copy of the order Exhibit M-2 dated 8th October, 1980 shows that on the basis of conviction of the claimant on his confession, the claimant was dismissed from service by the General Manager, Haryana Roadways Karnal on the ground that the claimant took liquor during duty period and was unable to drive the Bus which was full of passengers and created a scene on the public place which act was highly unbecoming of a public servant, especially when the lives of many passengers were in his hand. Shri Ajit Singh claimant WW-1, Shri Rajpal Assistant Fitter WW-2 and Shri Jagtar Singh Driver WW-4 have deposed that the vehicle became defective and was brought to the workshop. On the other hand, WW-3 Shri Sugra Ram, who was travelling in the Bus in Question has not uttered a word in this respect and stated that vehicle was brought to the Bus stand by the claimant. The version of WW-3 Shri Sugra Ram is, therefore, inconsistent with the version given by the other witnesses produced by the claimant. The facts of the case have been given in the order of dismissal, copy Exhibit M-2 and it is clearly stated that the accused drove the bus in question in a drunken condition and created nuisance on the public place namely Mall Road, Karnal. The claimant was challenged and he pleaded guilty to the charge and was thus convicted under Section 34 of the Police Act and was admonished by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Karnal,—vide order Copy Exhibit M-1 as mentioned above.

9. It was argued that no enquiry was held against the claimant and as such the order of dismissal was not justified. The argument has no force because the claimant was convicted in a criminal case on the basis of his confession and as such there was no need to hold domestic enquiry because it is well settled that if the facts are admitted by the claimant in criminal proceedings, there is no need to hold domestic enquiry. Consequently, the impugned order of dismissal passed by the Management was justified and in order and keeping in view the circumstances of this case, no interference with the sentence is called for because the General Manager, Haryana Roadways has given cogent reasons in his order, copy Exhibit M-2, while dismissing the claimant from our service and these reasons have already been mentioned above. Under all these circumstances, the dismissal of the claimant was justified and in order and as such the claimant is not entitled to any relief. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated 17th March, 1986.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement 198, dated 18th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9.9.86-6 Lab. 2905. In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Haryana Roadways, Karnal.

BEFORE SHRI R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 148/1982

between

SHRI OM PARKASH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M.S. HARYANA
ROADWAYS, KARNAL

Present. —

Shri O.P. Daryal, for the workman.

Shri S.N. Gaur, for the Management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Om Parkash Workman and the Management of M/s. Haryana Roadways, Karnal, to this Tribunal for adjudication : -

Whether the termination of service of Shri Om Parkash was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. In the demand notice dated 3rd October 1981 which was treated as claim statement on the request of the claimant, it was alleged that the claimant was employed as Conductor in Haryana Roadways, Karnal, and was placed under suspension on 4th April, 1979 and was served a charge-sheet on 11th April, 1979. It was further alleged that the enquiry was held against the claimant when one charge was not proved against the claimant. It was further alleged that the second show cause,

notice was given to the claimant, but he was dismissed on 2nd March, 1982. It was alleged that the allegations made against the claimant were false and as such the impugned order of dismissal being illegal was liable to be set aside. It was, therefore, prayed that the claimant be reinstated with full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement filed on 16th September, 1982, pleaded that there were two charges against the claimant out of which first charge was not proved against him, while second charge was proved against the claimant, due to which second show cause notice was given to the claimant and thereafter the order of dismissal was passed.

4. The claimant in his rejoinder dated 20th October, 1982, reiterated the pleas taken in the claim statement.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 17th November, 1982 :—

(1) Whether the enquiry is fair and proper ? OPM.

(2) Whether the termination of service of Shri Om Parkash was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ? OPM.

6. It may be mentioned that the Management has examined two witnesses and the documents Exhibit M-1 to M-6 have been tendered into evidence. The claimant has appeared in the witness box. After going the entire evidence and hearing the representatives of both the parties, my findings on the above issues are as under :—

Issue No. 1 :

7. The Management has examined MW-1 Shri Pawan Kumar Clerk, Haryana Roadways Karnal who stated that the chargesheet copy Exhibit M-1 was given to the claimant along with the document Exhibit M-2 and M-3 and that Exhibit M-4 was the copy of the explanation given by the claimant. He further stated that the Legal Advisor of Haryana Roadways was appointed as Enquiry Officer, who held the enquiry and that Exhibit M-5 and M-6 contained the enquiry proceedings. He further stated that the claimant was given full opportunity to produce his defence evidence and cross examine the witnesses and that Exhibit M-7 was the copy of the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer. He further stated that second show cause notice was given to the claimant, copy Exhibit M-8 and that ultimately the impugned order of dismissal copy Exhibit M-10 was passed. MW-2 Shri S.N. Gaur stated that he held the enquiry, against the claimant and that the Management examined Shri D.K. Sharma, Duty Inspector, while the claimant examined Shri Teja Singh and himself appeared in the witness box. He further stated that Exhibit M-1 to M-6 contained the enquiry proceedings, while Exhibit M-7 was the copy of the report submitted by him.

8. Shri Om Parkash claimant WW-1 stated that he was employed as Conductor in Haryana Roadways and was suspended on 4th April, 1979 because he was late by 15 minutes and that no other duty was allotted to him. He further stated that charge No. 1 was not proved against him in the enquiry.

9. A perusal of the above evidence would show that the claimant was chargesheeted,—*vide* chargesheet copy Exhibit M-2 as under :

(1) That on 3rd April, 1979, the claimant informed the Duty Inspector that he would not go on duty on the local route, but should be sent either on the long route or Agond route.

(2) That on 4th April, 1979, the claimant was put on duty on Karnal Gullah Route, but did not come for duty at 8.00 a.m. and since he did not report for duty upto 8.15 a.m., therefore, Shri Chamail Singh Conductor was deputed on that route, due to which passengers were put to inconvenience.

The enquiry was held by Shri S.N. Gaur and enquiry proceedings Exhibit M-5 to M-6 go to show that the Management examined Shri D.K. Sharma Duty Inspector, while the claimant examined Shri Teja Singh and also appeared in the witness box. The enquiry report copy Exhibit M-7 shows that charge No. 1 was not proved against the claimant while charge No. 2 stood proved against him. The defence plea taken by the claimant was that he came for duty at 8.05 on 4th April, 1979 but he was not permitted by the Duty Inspector to proceed on duty to Karnal Gullah Route, but on the other hand, he was threatened that he would be placed under suspension. The Enquiry Officer did not believe the defence version on the ground that the duty Inspector waited upto 8.15 a.m., but the claimant did not come when Shri Chamail Singh Conductor was deputed to Karnal Gullah Route. The Enquiry Officer, therefore, considered the testimony of Shri D.K. Sharma Duty Inspector and defence evidence produced by the claimant and after rejecting the defence version, held that charge No. 2 stood proved against the claimant. I have gone through the enquiry proceedings and no interference with the findings given by the Enquiry Officer on charge No. 2 is called for because the same is based on evidence, Especially when the Enquiry Officer considered the defence version of the claimant and rejected the same after giving cogent reasons. Under all these circumstances, it is held that the enquiry is fair and proper. The enquiry is decided accordingly in favour of the Management.

Issue No. 2.

10. As already mentioned above charge No. 1 was not proved against the claimant. Only charge No. 2 has been proved against him because the claimant did not report for duty upto 8.15 A.M. on 4th April, 1979 due to which Shri Chamail Singh Conductor was deputed on Karnal Gulha Route.

11. It was argued by the representative of the claimant that the punishment of dismissal was harsh and severe while the argument from the management side was that the punishment was proportionate to the misconduct proved against the claimant. The claimant came late on 4th April, 1979, due to which another conductor had to be sent on Karnal Gulha Route. This act of misconduct does not justify the punishment of dismissal. Keeping in view the circumstances of this case, the impugned order of dismissal is set aside. The ends of justice would be met if the claimant is reinstated, but should be deprived of his full back wages and his two increments be stopped with cumulative effect. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated : 18th March, 1986.

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 208, dated 19th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9/9/86-6Lab./2906.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Special Machine Kunjpura Road, Karnal.

BEFORE R. N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 470/1982

Between

SHRI RAJ PAL SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SPECIAL MACHINE
KUNJPURA ROAD, KARNAL

Present :—

Shri. D.P. Pathak for the workman.
Shri J.P. Singh for the Management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Raj Pal Singh Workman and the Management of M/s Special Machine, Kunjpura Road, Karnal, to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Raj Pal Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. The claimant in his claim statement dated 24th January, 1983 alleged that he was employed as Machineman in the respondent factory, but the Management terminated his services on 4th March, 1982. It was further alleged that with the intervention of the Labour Inspector Karnal, the Management agreed to provide duty to the claimant on 29th April, 1982. It was further alleged that the respondent allotted duty to the claimant in open during the month of May, 1982, when he made a complaint on 3rd May, 1982. It was further alleged that the respondent terminated the services of the claimant on 6th May, 1982 illegally and as such he was entitled to reinstatement with full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement, dated 22nd February, 1983 pleaded that the services of the claimant were not terminated, but he absented himself from duty. It was further pleaded that the previously, the dispute between the parties was compromised when the claimant worked upto 3rd May, 1982 and ultimately he came on 5th May, 1982 for half day and thereafter he absented himself from duty.

4. The claimant, in his rejoinder, dated 22nd February, 1983 reiterated the pleas taken in the claim statement.

5. On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed on 22nd March, 1983:—

(1) Whether the workman absented himself of his own accord ? OPM

(2) Whether the termination of service of Shri Raj Pal Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ? OPM.

6. It may be mentioned that the Management has examined one witness and documents Ex. M-1 to M-3 have been tendered into evidence. The claimant has appeared in the witness box and has examined one witness and documents Ex. W-1 and W-2 have been tendered into evidence. After going through the entire evidence and hearing the representative of both the parties, my findings on the above issues are as under :—

Issue No. 1—

7. The Management has examined MW-1 Shri Ajay Gupta, Accountant in the respondent factory, who stated that the previous dispute between the parties was settled on 28th April, 1982,—*vide* documents, Ex. M-1 to M-3 and that the claimant joined duty on 29th April, 1982 and half day on 30th April, 1982,—*vide* slip copy Ex. M-4. He also proved the attendance sheets copies Ex. M-4 to M-6 and stated that the claimant left the job on 5th May, 1982. He also stated he gave the demand notice, dated 3rd May, 1982 copy Ex. M-7, which was filed,—*vide* order Ex. M-8 and that the second demand notice was given by him on 22nd June, 1982. He also stated that Ex. M-9 contained the comments given in the Conciliation Proceedings. He further stated that the services of the claimant had not been terminated so far and his name existed on the muster rolls. Ex. M-10 is the copy of the attendance register while Ex. M-11 is the copy of the letter received from E.S.I. and Ex. M-12 is the copy of the Certified Standing Orders. Ex. M-13 is the copy of Demand notice.

8. Shri Raj Pal Singh claimant WW-1 stated that he joined service in the respondent factory in 1979 but he was removed on 4th March, 1983. He further stated that on his complaint to the Labour Inspector, the settlement Ex. W-2 took place when he joined duty on 29th April, 1982 but he was made to sit outside the factory in the sun upto 5th May, 1982. He further stated that on 6th May, 1982, he was not allowed to join duty. He further stated that no notice pay or compensation was paid to him nor any enquiry was held by the Management. Ex. W-1 is the copy of the report submitted by the Conciliation Officer. WW-2 Shri Mohan Lal stated that he knew the claimant. He further stated that the claimant was allowed to join duty after the settlement, but he was made to sit outside the factory in open. He further stated that no compensation or notice pay was given to the claimant.

9. A perusal of the above evidence would show that the previous dispute between the parties was settled on 28th April, 1982,—*vide* document Ex. M-3 and that the claimant worked on 29th April, 1982 and for half day on 30th April, 1982,—*vide* document Ex. M-6. Document Ex. M-5 shows that the claimant remained on duty on 4th May, 1982 and for half day on 5th May, 1982,—*vide* document Ex. M-8 and there after he absented himself. The document Ex. M-4 shows that the wages were paid to him on 4th May, 1982 for the period he worked in April, 1982. Ex. M-10 is the copy of the attendance register from January, 1984 to December, 1984, in which the claimant has been marked absent. The Management has thus led oral as well as documentary evidence to show that the claimant absented himself from duty with effect from 5th May, 1982, but his name has not yet been struck off from the Muster Rolls. The oral testimony of the claimant that his services were terminated cannot be accepted because the Management has led documentary evidence to show that name of the claimant still exist in the muster roll and that he absented himself from the duty with effect from 6th May, 1982. The issue is decided accordingly in favour of the Management.

Issue No. 2—

10. In view of my findings on issue No. 1, it is held that the services of the claimant have not been terminated by the Management so far, but the claimant absented himself from duty with effect from 6th May, 1982 and further that the claimant can join duty, but without any back wages, because no back wages can be paid to him for absenting himself from duty with effect from 6th May, 1982. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated the 19th March, 1986

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endst No. 209, Dated 19th March, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.